REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated February 25, 2008. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 4-8 and 12-19 are under consideration in this application. Claims 2-3 and 10-11 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 4-8, 12-16 and 19 are being amended, as set forth in the above marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to correct formal errors and/or to more particularly define and distinctly claim applicant's invention.

All the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter or new issue is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formality Rejection

Claim 19 was still rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. As indicated, the claims are amended as required or suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding informality rejections is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 4-6 and 12-14 were still rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Norcott et al. (US 6,775,518) in view of Morton et al. (US Publication No. 2005/0216443), claims 7-8 and 15-19 were still rejected over Norcott '518 and Morton '443 in view of Remschel (US Patent No. 6,411,796). These rejections have been carefully considered, but are most respectfully traversed.

The invention as now recited in claims 2, 10 & 19 not only (1) extracts text information and/or drawing information from the video information included in the class information, extracts text information from the audio information included in the class information, and correlates the video information with the lecture-related information by

comparing the text information and/or the drawing information with the lecture-related information (cancelled claim 2), but also adds time information relating to lecture contents comprising the source of the text information and/or the drawing information to the extracted text information and/or drawing information, and extracts words from the text information, extracts time information on locations where specified words frequently appear in the text information, and selects the video information corresponding to the time information (original claim 4). The analyzer adds time information relating to lecture contents to the extracted text information per sentence and/or to the extracted drawing information per drawing. The matcher section extracts words from said extracted text information and said extracted drawing information, extracts time information on word locations where specified words frequently appear in said extracted text information and said extracted drawing information, extracts said video information corresponding to said specified words in each sentence or in each drawing with said time information, and extracts said audio information corresponding to said specified words in each sentence with said time information. Said send section sends practice problems **including plural problems** each of which relates to said lecture contents as said lecture-related information, and said control section selects lecture contents **to be sent among lecture contents** linked with **each of said problems included in** said practice problems based on true-false judgment results of replies to **each of said problems included in** said practice problems sent from said student terminal (claim 5).

The voice text data is divided up into voice sections (sentences) ([0085]), the image data are divided by image (drawings in the class material, etc.) on a clipboard shown to the students by the instructor ([0086]). The start time and end times that were added to the audio or video data as time stamps ([0085]; Fig. 10). This program 101207 extracts locations in the divided data with time stamps where the same term frequently occurs, for both the course materials as well as the review problem data. Video frame data for review problems linked to a review problem No. are created for locations where the frequently appearing words in the integrated data with-time-stamp matches the review problem data and course material data and this video frame data is stored in the hard disk 1013 ([0063]; Fig. 6). A word name, appearance count, time span start time, time span end time are stored for each frequently appearing word in the data storage area in time span data word units (S3003) ([0093]; Fig. 11). The program 101207 extracts the time span where collation results show the same word frequently appears, storing it as word unit overlap flag data (S3002 to S3005) ([0100]; Fig. 12). Video frame data for a location corresponding to the time span of the integrated data is

extracted from the above stored time span information of the drawing correlation data and the text correlation data. Using this data, video frame data matching the review problem and linked to the review problem number (No.) is generated and stored in the data storage area 101306 (S3012) ([0105]), and then present for the student to review.

According to the present invention, a frequency of appearances of a specified word in the text information is used to extract corresponding audio data per sentence and corresponding video data per image/drawing to present to a student. Therefore, the locations emphasized by the teacher becomes clear, and the point of lecture becomes clear. As such, the students can recognized the lecture with high accuracy, and the students can appropriately select points which are required for learning ([0139]-[0140]).

Claim 4 now defines the practice problems sent by the send section and the lecture contents selected by the control section to make it clear that the present invention selects lecture contents in accordance with understanding of the student. In other words, the practice problems sent by the send section includes plural problems, and each of the plural problems included in the practice problems relates to the lecture contents as the lecture-related information. The lecture contents to be sent are selected from among lecture contents linked with each of the problems included in the practice problems, and the control section selects lecture contents based on true-false judgment results of replies to each of the problems included in the practice problems sent from the student terminal.

Applicants respectfully contend that none of the cited references teach or suggest "extracting words from the extracted text information, extracting time information on word locations where specified words frequently appear in the extracted text information, extracting the video information corresponding to the specified words, linking the video information with the lecture-related information based on results from comparing the lecture-related information with the extracted text information; selecting lecture contents based on true-false judgment results (understanding of the student) and sending the selected lecture contents to the student terminal" as the present invention. In particular, none of the cited the cited references teach or suggest "selecting lecture contents in accordance with understanding of the student" as the present invention.

Applicants contend that neither Norcott, Morton, Remschel, nor their combinations teach or suggest each and every feature of the present invention as recited in independent claims 4, 12, and 19. As such, the present invention as now claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the rejections raised in the Office Action. The withdrawal of the

outstanding prior art rejections is in order, and is thus respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200
May 27, 2008
SPF/JCM/JT